

the COSMOS frame order. It becomes critical that the ALEC have provided accurate information on the LSR. The ALEC must have properly identify their equipment in the central office in order for the BellSouth technician to connect the loop to the correct assignment of the ALEC equipment.

Response Provided by: Brian Blanchard, Jerry Latham, and Kenneth L. Ainsworth

ACSI-2 As of July 25, 1996, identify each computer or other electronic system BellSouth had in place which was in any way intended to be used for the receipt, tracking, processing, or installation of unbundled loops ordered by telecommunications carriers such as ACSI, and state whether the system was fully prepared to perform as intended on that date. If you claim that a system was not fully operational, identify its status as of July 25, 1996 and state what activities needed to be performed to make the system fully operational.

Response: See Response to ACSI-1. Each system has been identified in that Response. As of July 25, 1996, each of those systems was fully operational and fully prepared to perform as intended, except for correction of the problems identified in the Response to ACSI-12, below, and a minor database change in TIRKS and EXACT to recognize the NC/NCI (Network Channel/Network Channel Interface) codes for unbundled local loops connected to an ALEC's collocated equipment. That change was made between November 14 and November 19, 1996.

Response Provided by: Brian Blanchard and Kenneth L. Ainsworth

ACSI-3: As of July 25, 1996, identify each manual or other non-electronic system BellSouth had in place which was in any way intended to be used for the receipt, tracking, processing, or installation of unbundled loops ordered by telecommunications carriers such as ACSI, and state whether the system was fully prepared to perform as intended on that date. If you claim that a system was not fully operational, identify its status as of July 25, 1996 and state what activities needed to be performed to make the system fully operational.

Response: Any manual activities involved in the receipt, tracking, processing, and installation of unbundled loops are identified in the Response to ACSI-1. As of July 25, 1996, BellSouth was capable of performing these manual activities.

Response Provided by: Jerry Latham

ACSI-4: As of November 19, 1996, identify each computer or other electronic system BellSouth had in place which was in any way intended to be used for the receipt, tracking, processing, or installation of unbundled loops ordered by telecommunications carriers such as ACSI, and state whether the system was fully prepared to perform as intended on that date. If you claim that a system was not fully operational, identify its status as of November 19, 1996 and state what activities needed to be performed to make the system fully operational.

Response: The Response to ACSI-2 is applicable to this interrogatory.

Response Provided by: Jerry Latham

ACSI-5: As of November 19, 1996, identify each manual or other non-electronic system BellSouth had in place which was in any way intended to be used for the receipt, tracking, processing, or installation of unbundled loops ordered by telecommunications carriers such as ACSI, and state whether the system was fully prepared to perform as intended on that date. If you claim that a system was not fully operational, identify its status as of November 19, 1996 and state what activities needed to be performed to make the system fully operational.

Response: The Response to ACSI-3 is applicable to this interrogatory.

Response Provided by: Jerry Latham

ACSI-6 Please provide the basis for your statement in paragraph 53 of the Answer that “BellSouth had the ability to provide unbundled loops at that time.” Identify whether BellSouth had the ability to meet the standards set forth in Section IV of the Interconnection Agreement for the installation of unbundled loops, precisely how BellSouth could provide unbundled loops at the time referred to in the statement and identify what “time” is referred to in this statement.

Response: When BellSouth negotiated the Interconnection Agreement with ACSI, BellSouth planned to utilize its existing special access service processes as the basis for ordering and provisioning unbundled loops. Minor modifications of the procedures and ordering documents were required to distinguish unbundled loops from special access service circuits so that unbundled loops could be ordered via EXACT, inventoried in TIRKS, and billed. Thus, BellSouth had the ability to meet the standards set forth in Section IV for the installation of unbundled loops at the time it negotiated the Interconnection Agreement.

Response Provided by: Jerry Latham

ACSI-7: Please provide the basis for your statement in paragraph 53 of the Answer that BellSouth “had not yet fully tested and refined the procedures to be used for ordering and providing them [unbundled loops].” Without limiting the scope of this request, your answer should at a minimum, identify what “procedures” were “to be used for ordering and providing” unbundled loops, what “time” is referred to by this statement and what testing had and had not been performed as of that time.

Response: At the time BellSouth negotiated the Interconnection Agreement, BellSouth had not yet had an opportunity to test its procedures for coordinated disconnection of existing service and ordering and provisioning of unbundled loops and associated SPNP in conjunction with ACSI’s processes for ordering unbundled loops and associated SPNP or with ACSI’s processes for coordinating cutovers of customers from BellSouth to ACSI. Section XVIII of the Interconnection Agreement requires such joint testing as part of the schedule for implementation of the Interconnection Agreement. Such joint testing would, for example, have revealed the need to update the NC/NCI codes, as discussed in the Response to ACSI-2, since ACSI was the first ALEC to request that BellSouth connect unbundled loops to collocated equipment. Joint testing would also have revealed the stenciling errors on ACSI’s collocated equipment in Columbus, as discussed in response to ACSI-19 and ACSI-20, as well as the problems discussed in the Response to ACSI-12.

The procedures to be used for ordering unbundled loops are described in the Response to ACSI-1, above. The procedures for ordering unbundled loops with associated SPNP are described in the Facilities-Based Ordering Guidelines provided by BellSouth in its document production on March 17. See BellSouth Documents ##00565 *et seq.*

Response Provided by: Martha Jackson, Brian Blanchard

ACSI-8: With reference to the statements in paragraph 53 identified in the preceding two requests, identify what, if any, changes in BellSouth's abilities occurred between July 25, 1996 (or, if the statements refer to a different time, the time referred to in the statements) and November 19, 1996, and what, if any, additional "testing" and "refinement" BellSouth conducted or made between July 25, 1996 and November 19, 1996 to the "procedures to be used for ordering and providing" unbundled loops.

Response: Although BellSouth did not have the opportunity to conduct joint testing with ASCI between July 25 and November 19, 1996, BellSouth conducted the following internal tests of its systems for ordering and provisioning unbundled loops:

- Service orders were issued in July 1996 through November 1996 to test the flow through of unbundled service orders. The first service order testing was done to test the Reuse Field Identifiers (FIDs) to ensure that the disconnect of single-line voice grade service (Plain Old Telephone Service or POTS) and the add (connection) of the unbundled loop would flow and result in the reuse of the existing working local loop assignments (cable/pair). We found that this process worked if the orders were coordinated. First, the order would be associated with the disconnect and the correct FID. Next, the add issued would be issued, also with the correct FID.
- The service order was logged via the SOAC and TIRKS Systems. The circuit was designed manually, with an Estimated Measured Loss (EML) of 8.0db. The WORD was issued to the downstream systems (WFA, NSDB) to see the results. All systems received the service order and WORD document and CDOC sketches were developed. The test was successful. This first test was issued via cable and pair at the end user with a T1 facility at the ALEC location.
- Additional service orders were issued for the different types of services that were scheduled for the first round of tests (2Wire loop start, 2Wire ground start, 2Wire reverse battery, Basic Rate ISDN, 56 kb/s, and 64 kb/s). The Voice loops were tested with Subscriber Loop Carrier (SLC) and cable and pairs at the end user and TOTIE at the ALEC location.

These tests were necessary to ensure that all Universal Service Ordering Codes (USOCs) were coded properly in the SOAC and TIRKS Systems. The same basic class of service for all types of Unbundled Voice Loop (UVL) and Unbundled Digital Loop (UDL) was used. The USOCs

represent the various circuits and what type of facility could work with these circuits and that the circuit would be assigned correctly from LFACs.

This process worked correctly in the test system. We found that the downstream systems needed to identify the differences between the unbundled services. The same class of service could not be used. New Class of Service USOCs were requested and received for the different types of UVL/UDL. Service orders were issued in the test systems to test the flow in the downstream systems to see if this indeed would be sufficient. This proved to be successful.

Programmable Circuit Design System (PRO-CDS) models were requested, built and downloaded in all nine processors for the various UVL/UDL.

When an ALEC began requesting service in Florida, there were no T1 facilities, nor TOTIE (collocated) facilities. Most of the circuits requested went interoffice, and as a result interoffice facilities were assigned. This was not tested beforehand. We assumed that since it was POTS service the ALEC would be served from the same wire center as the end user. This was not the case.

When an EML is set in TIRKS it is hard coded to meet this objective. This was not a problem if the circuit was on cable and pair. The loss of the circuit (EML) would be whatever loss was in the local loop. But when interoffice facilities are added, TIRKS will try to meet the 8 Odb EML set for unbundled services. This caused a problem.

The Circuit Provisioning Group (CPG) was contacted by the Transmission Engineer to make the interoffice facilities and SLC assignment plug-ins transparent to the ALEC. This caused the CPG to re-do all PRO-CDS designs. The problem was not readily identified, and when it was brought to our attention, we began the correction process. To handle this request, new function codes had to be created internally for every plug-in that could be used on these circuits. Included with the new function codes were also new levels. All circuits that had voice levels were affected. The coding has been completed, and all two-wire UVL PRO-CDS models have been updated.

There was one other problem. If the end user was served via SLC, POTS plug-ins should have been in place (as for an existing BellSouth customer). The WORD document indicated Special POTS (SPOTS) plug-ins. This created confusion because Plug-In Control System (PICS) tried to ship the plug-ins. POTS plug-ins should have been used and should have been in place. Function codes did not exist for POTS plug-ins because POTS plug-ins were never used on a designed circuit. (Bellcore usually creates function codes for designed services.) BellSouth had to create function codes for POTS plug-ins to ensure they would no longer be ordered via TIRKS/PICS. PRO-CDS models had to be updated and this too has been resolved.

Response Provided by: Sharron Smith

ACSI-9: As of November 19, 1996, did BellSouth have the capability to provide unbundled loops and service provider number portability in accordance with the standards established in Section IV of the Interconnection Agreement? If you contend that BellSouth did not have the capability to provide unbundled loops at that time, identify each and every area in which you contend BellSouth lacked the capability and what was necessary for BellSouth to obtain that capability.

Response: As of November 19, 1996, BellSouth had the capability to provide unbundled loops and Service Provider Number Portability (SPNP) in accordance with the standards set forth in the Interconnection Agreement. As stated in the Facilities-Based Ordering Guidelines (See BellSouth Documents ##00566, 00618, and 00627), these orders must be coordinated and must be provisioned in conjunction with each other. Coordination is, of necessity, a responsibility of both parties to the agreement (both the ALEC and BellSouth). Upon notification by the ALEC that an unbundled loop order is to be coordinated with the provision of SPNP, BellSouth will schedule the project work needed to ensure that the conversion of the customer from BellSouth to the ALEC is made in a timely and accurate manner.

Response Provided by: Martha Jackson, Jerry Latham

ACSI-10: Identify each and every action BellSouth took in the first 30 days after July 25, 1996 to "adopt a schedule for the implementation of this Agreement" as referred to in Section XVIII of the Interconnection Agreement. For each action BellSouth took, your answer should, at a minimum, identify precisely what action was undertaken, the person(s) at BellSouth that took the action, the person(s) (if any) at ACSI that BellSouth contacted, the outcome of the action, and all persons at BellSouth with knowledge of the action taken.

Response: During that period of time, BellSouth's practice was to respond to implementation activity initiated by ALECs. When an ALEC requested the adoption of an implementation schedule, BellSouth worked with the ALEC to develop such a schedule. If the ALEC did not request an implementation schedule, BellSouth did not initiate such activity. ACSI contacted numerous BellSouth employees during that period regarding various implementation matters, but never requested the adoption of a comprehensive implementation schedule. BellSouth's employees worked closely with ACSI regarding each of ACSI's inquiries during that period.

In addition to responding to the multitude of inquiries from ACSI regarding the implementation of various elements of the Interconnection Agreement, on August 22, 1996, Gloria Calhoun, Director - Strategic Planning of BellSouth, and Nancy Murrah of ACSI had a telephone conversation that resulted in BellSouth's providing to ACSI, via overnight mail, two copies of the Facilities-Based Ordering Guidelines. Ms. Calhoun also held a conference call on August 23, 1996, with Ms. Murrah to respond to questions concerning that document and to discuss generally the ordering procedures described in that document. The Facilities-Based Ordering Guidelines were updated in October 1996 and a copy was mailed to Paul Kingman of ACSI on October 31.

Also, on August 14, 1996, Jim Linthicum, Jane Raulerson, and Stephanie Cowart of BellSouth met with Michelle Gemke, Brenda Renner, and other ACSI employees to discuss traffic flows, billing and records exchange on traffic between BellSouth and ACSI, and traffic involving third parties, such as other local exchange carriers, wireless service providers, and interexchange carriers.

Response Provided by: Gloria Calhoun, Stephanie Cowart, Kathleen Massey, Wade Johnson, Pinky Reichert

ACSI-11: Between July 25, 1996 and November 19, 1996, identify what requests, if any, BellSouth made for “any testing of the procedures for ordering unbundled loops” or “any testing of the technical aspects of unbundled loop cutovers” (see paragraph 62 of the Answer). If you contend that BellSouth made such a request, your answer should, at a minimum, identify which person(s) at BellSouth made the request, the person(s) at ACSI to whom the request was communicated, the manner in which the request was made (in person, by letter, etc.), and identify all documents which constitute, refer or relate to the request.

Response: BellSouth’s investigation has not disclosed any such requests.

Response Provided by: Ann Haymons

ACSI-12: Please explain in detail what additions, deletions, improvements, changes, or other modifications BellSouth made since November 27, 1996 to its procedures (whether computer, electronic, manual or other non-electronic) for receiving, processing, and installing orders for unbundled loops placed by ACSI. For each addition, deletion, improvement, change or other modification BellSouth made, state when it was made, what was done, why it was done, and how the action affected the receipt, processing or installation of ACSI orders for unbundled loops.

Response:

1. In December 1996, BellSouth changed its service order writing procedures for coordinated installation of an unbundled loop and disconnection of existing service to eliminate the RRSO (an indicator to reuse the existing loop) from N-orders (orders to establish SPNP) associated with the unbundled loop. Previously, in an attempt to coordinate the installation of the unbundled loop with the disconnection of the existing service and establishment of SPNP, BellSouth had placed the RRSO on the order to disconnect the existing service, the order to establish the unbundled loop, and the order to establish the SPNP. In December 1996, BellSouth discovered that this process did not have the intended effect. Instead of facilitating coordination of the installation and disconnection, the placement of the RRSO on both orders resulted in the elimination of the Frame Due Time (FDT) on the disconnect order when SOAC combined the two orders. Consequently, the order to disconnect existing service would be worked on the due date (usually early in the day) but would not be held until the FDT, when the unbundled loop was to be installed. Elimination of the RRSO from the associated SPNP order caused SOAC to retain the FDT on the disconnect order and resulted in the automatic release of the disconnect order at the FDT.

2. In December 1996, BellSouth changed its service order writing procedures to show 9:00 PM in the FDT field on orders requiring coordination and to show the desired cutover time in the remarks section of the orders instead of in the FDT field. This change was made to prevent the automatic release of the disconnect order for existing service at the desired cutover time. This change provided flexibility for the manual coordination of cutovers without automatic service order processing. Without this change, the customer's existing service might be disconnected at the desired cutover time indicated in the FDT field even if any delays were encountered in the cutover process.

3. In December 1996, BellSouth corrected an error in LFACS. The error caused LFACS to fail to recognize that loop facilities on universal digital loop carriers could be reused in the provision of an unbundled loop. The effect of the correction was to eliminate delays resulting from manual assignment of loop facilities.

4. In December 1996, BellSouth enhanced its coordination of the installation of unbundled loops by assigning a project manager for coordination of ACSI's orders and by adopting the use of cutsheets, which collect all of the required data for efficiently processing cutovers.

The foregoing modifications are the only modifications since November 27, 1996, that relate to the problems encountered in BellSouth's provision of unbundled loops to ACSI in Columbus, Georgia, in November and December 1996.

Response Provided by: Brian Blanchard, Ken Ainsworth

ACSI-13: Please explain the meaning of each column on the document attached as Exhibit 6 to the Rebuttal testimony of Alphonso J. Varner, filed February 24, 1997 in Georgia PSC docket no. 6863-U, and identify all documents which form the basis for the information contained in that document. A copy of Varner Exhibit 6 is attached.

Response:

"PON#" means Purchase Order Number - The purchase order number is provided by ACSI on its orders for service.

"Date Rec." means Date Order Received by BellSouth - The date the order is received is logged by the EXACT system or is printed by the facsimile machine.

"Requested Service/Order Numbers" - The service requested on the Order by ACSI and BellSouth's Order Numbers to related to the service requested. The BellSouth Order numbers are generated by BellSouth's systems (SOCS/SOAC). The remarks section of ACSI's Orders or the EXACT system would detail the service being ordered.

"FDT" means Frame Due Time - The FDT was provided by ACSI on each of its Orders.

"FOC" means Firm Order Confirmation - The FOC was provided to ACSI upon release of an accurate Order into the BellSouth ordering systems.

"CDD" means Customer Due Date - The Customer Due Date was provided by ACSI on each of its Orders.

"Date Service Est." means Date Service Established - This date was provided by the BellSouth systems and central office technicians upon the completion of the service Order.

"OOS" means Out of Service - This is the amount of time between disconnection of the existing BellSouth service and the connection of the unbundled loop to ACSI.

“Pend.” means Orders pending - The number of Orders which have been received by BellSouth from ACSI but have not been worked.

“Comp.” means Orders completed - The number of Orders that have been completed by BellSouth.

The documents which form the basis for information contained in the referenced document have already been produced, will be produced pursuant to ACSI’s document production requests, or have been identified elsewhere in these interrogatories.

Response Provided by: Eddie Owens

ACSI-14: With reference to paragraph 15 of the Answer, please explain in full the statement that “the service of several affected customers was disconnected due to a customer service representative’s error.” Without limiting the foregoing request, your answer should at a minimum identify which customers were affected by the alleged error, the duration of the service disconnection, the customer service representative that allegedly erred, the error that you allege occurred, and what actions BellSouth took to correct the alleged error.

Response: The error identified by BellSouth with reference to any of the orders in question is more properly described as an error by an RCMAG (Recent Change Administration Group) clerk. On December 5, 1996, Paula Murphy, a Supervisor in BellSouth’s LCSC, called the RCMAG unit to request that the unit put a hold on an order to disconnect the existing service of Joseph Wiley (PON # I00047CMB) to prevent the system from automatically releasing the order prior to the installation of the unbundled loop. When the FDT arrived, the RCMAG clerk who reviewed the order released the order in error. The clerk’s supervisor discussed the error with the clerk to reinforce the clerk’s understanding of BellSouth’s procedures.

Response Provided by: Ken Ainsworth

ACSI-15: Identify when BellSouth contends that it received ACSI service orders identified with Purchase Order Numbers ("PONs") I00042CMB, I00043CMB, I00044CMB, I00045CMB, I00047CMB, and identify all documents upon which BellSouth bases its claim concerning the date these orders were received.

Response: The original and subsequent versions of these orders were received as stated below
The sources of this information are documents produced by BellSouth and are indicated by their stamped numbers.

PON I00042CMB

- Received in EXACT from BDS Tellis on 11/13/96 (Copies will be produced on April 1.)
- FAXED: 11/15/96 (BellSouth Documents ##00024, 00025, 00026)
- FAXED: 11/18/96 (BellSouth Documents ##00021, 00022, 00023)
- FAXED: 11/18/96 (BellSouth Documents ##00027, 00028, 00029, 00021, 00022, 00023, 00024, 00025, 00031, 00032, 00033, 00034)
- FAXED: 11/14/96 (BellSouth Documents ##00018)
- FAXED: 11/15/96 (BellSouth Documents ##00020)
- FAXED: 11/15/96 (BellSouth Documents ##00019)
- FAXED: 11/20/96 (BellSouth Documents ##00030)

PON I00043CMB

- FAXED: 11/25/96 (BellSouth Documents ##00041, 00042, 00043)
- FAXED: 11/25/96 (BellSouth Document #00044)
- FAXED: 11/25/96 (BellSouth Document #00044)
- FAXED: 12/02/96 (BellSouth Documents ##00047, 00048, 00049)
- FAXED: 12/02/96 (BellSouth Documents ##00050, 00051, 00052, 00053, 00054)

PON I00044CMB

- FAXED: 11/25/96 (BellSouth Documents ##00065, 00066, 00067, 00068)
- FAXED: 11/25/96 (BellSouth Document #00069)

PON I00045CMB

- FAXED: 11/25/97 (BellSouth Documents ##00071, 00072, 00073, 00074)
- FAXED: 11/25/96 (BellSouth Documents ##00075, 00076)
- FAXED: 11/25/96 (BellSouth Documents ##00077, 00078, 00079)
- FAXED: 11/25/96 (BellSouth Documents ##000080, 00081)

PON I00047CMB

- FAXED: 12/02/96 (BellSouth Documents ##00083, 00084, 00085)

- FAXED: 12/02/96 (BellSouth Document #00086)
- FAXED: 12/04/96 (BellSouth Document #00087)
- FAXED: 12/04/96 (BellSouth Documents ##00088)
- FAXED MEMO: 12/5/96 (BellSouth Document #00171)
- FAXED: 12/11/97 (BellSouth Documents ##00093, 00094, 00095)
- FAXED: 12/11/96 (BellSouth Document #00092)
- FAXED: 12/11/97 (BellSouth Documents ##00093, 00094, 00095, 00096, 00097, 00098, 00099, 00100, 00101, 00102, 00105, 00106, 00107, 00108)

Response Provided by: Martha Jackson

ACSI-16: Does BellSouth contend that it requested a due date for PONs I0042CMB, I00043CMB, I00044CMB, I00045CMB, or I00047CMB other than that requested by ACSI in those orders? If so, for each PON that you claim BellSouth requested a different due date, identify the due date requested by ACSI, the due date requested by BellSouth, the person(s) that requested a change in the due date, the manner in which the request was made, the person(s) at ACSI to whom the request was communicated, the date upon which BellSouth first attempted to install the loops ordered in the PON, and all documents which form the basis for your answers.

Response: No.

Response Provided by: Martha Jackson

ASCI-17: For PONs I00042CMB, I00043CMB, I00044CMB, I00045CMB, and I00047CMB, identify each date and time upon which BellSouth attempted to install the service requested by ACSI, what was done on each date and time, and the date and time upon which the service requested in the PON was established.

Response: See BellSouth Documents ## 00001 *et seq.* produced on March 17. The information in those documents was extracted from BellSouth's Work Force Administration (WFA) log and its service order records. Information about some attempts to install these services may have been lost due to the cancellation and reissue of orders. The following is a verbatim of that information, which has been extracted from the WFA log and the service order records and collated to show the events in chronological order:

| PON I00042CMB | ASR 9631800030 | ORD CO15PPD4 |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 11/13/96 | 1008 | Order Received in EXACT |
| 11/13/96 | 1621 | A57 passed expedite to Pam Jones in GA ISC |
| 11/15/96 | 1017 | KS1 Angie called for status. Checked TIRKS, not designed. Checked WFA Log 11-14 FAB Ticket and first level escalation. Called Pam in GA ISC, advised second level escalation. Pam advised if not designed by 1100 will 3rd level. Advised Angie. She will call back. |
| 11/15/96 | 1215 | A57 called Pam Jones and she got Barbara in CPG on line and she advised she is unable to design. She got Linda Anderson on line who is the person that is going to design model and Linda advised that she is going to look and design as quickly as possible. There is a problem and they are not sure what it is but they have escalated to Mary Fagan. |

| | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| 11/15/96 | 1239 | A01 Pam Jones called. Advised circuit should have been installed yesterday. Customer very upset. Advised on Notes above. Designing circuit now. Will advise of DD when ICSC notifies ICSC. Customer advised will refer to Connie Conley @ 1130 if not heard from anyone. Referred to Barbara Jones @ 1035 to get circuit installed today. ICSC received ASR 0830 11/13/96. |
| 11/15/96 | 1241 | A57 called Pam Jones, advised working on this PON and verified what CFA's are and they are correct and I also advised her that I don't show anything spare on 80001 but she says entire TOTIE should be spare. |
| 11/15/96 | 1517 | A57 Order is wrong, NC code should be LZ-Z and should be GA @ the other LCSC and I passed her to Barbara Gene Warren who educated Pam Jones on how to send her order and give her the correct TN and their fax number because they are no line. I am going to cancel this PON. |
| PON I00042CMB | ASR 9632000145 | ORD COB96R02 |
| 11/15/96 | 1638 | Received order in EXACT. |
| 11/15/96 | | Order input into SOCS with a Due Date of 11/18/96. |
| 11/18/96 | 1207 | Received order in WFA/C. |
| 11/18/96 | 1403 | Received Sup with corrected Tel. Nos. and change DD to 11/20/96. (Documentation SPNP request from Lisa Janders, ACSI.) |
| 11/20/96 | 0909 | 6FS called IMP number and reached recording saying to leave a VMS which I did, requesting call back before 1500. |
| 11/20/96 | 1243 | 6FS called IMP number again and reached David at ACSI who said he is at lunch and will call me back. |